

THE DAILY JOURNAL

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1895.

WASHINGTON OFFICE—1410 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

Telephone Calls.

Business Office—2881 10th Street.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

DAILY BY MAIL.

Daily only, one month, \$1.00

Daily only, three months, \$2.70

Daily only, one year, \$10.00

Daily, including Sunday, one year, \$12.00

Sunday only, one year, \$2.00

WHEN FURNISHED BY AGENTS.

Daily per week, by carrier, 15 cts

Daily per week, by mail, 10 cts

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscribers with any of our numerous agents or send

subscriptions to the

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,

Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in

the United States should put on an eight-page paper

one-cent postage stamp, and in foreign countries

a three-cent postage stamp. Foreign

postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in

this paper must be sent to the Editor, and be

accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL.

Can be found at the following places:

PAULS—American Exchange in Paris, 26 Boulevard

des Capucines.

NEW YORK—Gibbs House, Windsor Hotel and

Hotel Hamilton.

PHILADELPHIA—A. P. Kemple, cor. Lancaster

and Arch streets.

CHICAGO—Truman Hotel, Auditorium Hotel and

P. O. News Co., 91 Adams street.

CINCINNATI—J. B. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine st.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Dearing, northwest corner of

Third and Jefferson streets.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House, Edith Hotel,

Waldorf Hotel, and the Washington News Ex-

change, 14th street, bet. Penn. ave. and F street.

Now that the Carlisle-Springer currency

bill is in its little grave, what next?

The Journal congratulates the Repub-

lican Legislature which meets to-day—

the first of that party since 1873.

The best thing this Congress can do

is to do nothing. In that way only can

it be sure of making no mistake.

When the treasury deficit shall be re-

moved the real cause of the depletion

of the gold reserve will have been re-

moved.

If the Democratic Congress does nothing

to stop the deficit of eight or ten

million dollars a month it confesses to

the world its unparalleled incapacity.

From present indications the adminis-

tration will have to look to a Repub-

lican Congress for financial relief. It is

a case of "Help me, Cassius, or I sink."

The vote that killed the Carlisle cur-

rency bill brought down the President

as well as the Secretary of the Treas-

ury and left Chairman Springer on the

flat of his back.

Illinois now has the unenviable dis-

tinction of possessing the only Governor

who caters to the anarchic element.

But Illinois has repented the folly of

1892 in sackcloth and ashes.

John R. Wilson is the one Democrat

whose united courage and devotion were

equal to the task of saying a good word

for the administration at a late hour of

the Democratic wake, but a compara-

tively early hour Wednesday morning.

The one Democrat who had the courage

to defend the President in the presence

of his foes should be remembered.

The time seems appropriate to remind

Republican members of the Legislature,

in the words of a deceased Republican

President, that "he serves his party

best who serves his country best." The

way to make the Republican party in

Indiana solid with the people is to make

it promotive of public interests. It

cannot be done by scrambling after

spoils.

St. Jackson's day appears to have

afforded an opportunity to a number of

the lesser lights of the Democracy in

several cities to assail the administra-

tion. To prevent a row the New York

meeting was hastily adjourned after

adopting resolutions requesting the

President to "go back to the Chicago

platform." The frequently ridiculous

Mr. Thurman, of Ohio, son of ex-Senator

Thurman, declared at the meeting in

Columbus that if the financial legisla-

tion the President and Secretary Carlisle

advocated was Democratic then his

father "had never taught his son Demo-

cracy as he imbibed it from Jefferson,

Jackson, Calhoun and Benton."

The canvass for Speaker, which ended

in the nomination of Mr. Adams, leaves

no scars. From first to last it was con-

ducted in a manly spirit. No word of

bitterness has been spoken. Such men

as Merritt, Stutesman and Cardwell and

the other candidates for Speaker com-

mended themselves during the canvass

to the friends of the party by their

other States. The Republicans, the sound currency Democrats and the advocates of the free coinage of silver voted the votes to kill the bill. Mr. Springer is the only one of the champions of the bill who talks of attempting to call it up again. Secretary Carlisle, as well as the President, had set his heart upon its passage, and he takes its sudden death very hard. It was the most ill-considered financial scheme that an administration has ever recommended.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON TRIAL.

The meeting of a new Legislature is always an interesting event. The responsibility of legislating for more than two millions of people is a great one, and to a certain extent the honor and welfare of the State are in the keeping of every General Assembly that convenes. The acts of the Legislature affect local interests much more directly and come much nearer home to the people than those of Congress. And the people watch the proceedings of the Legislature more closely than they formerly did. As the material development of the State increases there are more interests to be affected by legislation, and greater anxiety is felt that mischievous and unwise laws shall not be passed. Then, the proceedings of the Legislature are much more fully reported and widely circulated and read than they used to be. Fifty years ago the people knew very little of what a Legislature was doing or had done until it had adjourned and its acts were officially published. Now they know almost from day to day.

The eyes of the people are on the Legislature all the time, and the daily reports of its proceedings are read in all parts of the State. These considerations should impress members with a due sense of the gravity of the duties devolved upon them and of their responsibility to the people.

There is a special reason why the majority in the Legislature that meets to-day should feel a special sense of responsibility. For the first time in more than twenty years the Republicans have a working majority in both branches and are therefore responsible for legislation. They occupy the same relative position towards the State that the Democratic party did towards the country when it gained control of the national government for the first time in nearly a quarter of a century. From a minority they have suddenly become a majority party. For many years past the Republicans of Indiana have been criticizing legislation and demanding reforms; now they are in a position where they must enact laws and institute reforms. It is to be hoped the majority in the Legislature which meets to-day will have a real realization of the fact that the eyes of the people are upon them, and that through them the Republican party of Indiana is on trial. Their election is at once a vote of confidence in the Democratic party and a vote of confidence in the Republican. It rests with them to decide by their acts and by the record which the Legislature shall make whether the recent verdict of the people shall be affirmed or reversed at the next election.

AN EXCELLENT BEGINNING.

The results of the Republican legislative caucuses are promises of good results. The selection of Hon. L. P. Newby, of Knightstown, for President pro tem. of the Senate was foreshadowed weeks ago by unanimous action. During the last Legislature he won the reputation of being a clear-headed, conscientious and influential member. He is one of the young Republicans of whom Indiana has so many of whom the party is proud. He will bring to the responsible position to which he has been called experience, ability and brightness. With such names as Adams, Stutesman, Allen, Cardwell, Holloway, Wiloughby, Newhouse, Stakebaek, Leedy, Remy and Moore to select from, the Republicans of the House would have had a capable Speaker if either of them had been selected. It is not invidious, even with such a list as has been given, to say that the honor could not have fallen to one better qualified than Justus C. Adams. He is a man of the highest integrity. With a large experience, he possesses in a high degree a practical good sense which is the best quality of ability. The fact that nearly every active Republican in Marion county took an eager interest in his candidacy is high testimony to his worth as a man. Equally fortunate were both branches in the selection of chief clerks. By common consent that position in the Senate fell to Mr. R. B. Oglesbee, of Plymouth. He is a lawyer of excellent attainments and a man highly esteemed for his good qualities. He was one of the young Republicans whose influence was so potent in the recent campaign. Mr. Robert A. Brown, of Franklin, is so well known and so thoroughly appreciated as one of the coming young men of Indiana that the chief clerkship of the House came to him by acclamation. He is one of the ablest Republican editors in the State. Both these men come to the position for which they have been designated without a pledge, and both select subordinates because of their fitness. There will be no bill stealing and no disreputable practices under these honest and competent men.

If that sense of responsibility and that public spirit which pervaded the caucuses of last night and expressed in the remarks of the candidates is an earnest of the accomplishment of the Republican Legislature it will merit the approval of the people of Indiana.

OUR LAKE TRADE.

A Cleveland paper prints a picture of a passenger steamer which has just been built and launched. It is a fine ship, which shows that inland ship building and lake traffic bear no mean comparison with those of the seaboard. The steamer referred to is 333 feet long, with a breadth of beam of forty-four feet and depth of hold thirty-four and a half feet. Some of the Atlantic steamers are not as large as this, though others are considerably larger.

The fact that it takes many floating palaces like this to accommodate the passenger traffic on our northern lakes shows how great it is, and the freight traffic is correspondingly great. A recent report on lake commerce by the Labor Commissioner of Ohio gives some interesting statistics on this point. It shows that the entire lake system has an area of 95,275 square miles, comprising over one-half of the fish water surface of the earth. To traverse its entire length requires a voyage of 1,275 miles, and the extreme points reached

by its northern and southern coasts lie, on a straight line, 500 miles apart. Along the 2,075 miles of lake coast line on the United States side are cities and towns aggregating a population of nearly 3,000,000. American vessels to the number of 5,000 and costing over \$7,000,000 are manned by 40,000 seamen. Not less than \$15,000,000 is invested in ship building in various lake ports, and during the last year the amount of freight carried on the lakes was 21,000,000 tons, valued at \$400,000,000.

This meager outline of our lake commerce, which is as yet in its infancy and capable of indefinite expansion, shows its great importance and vast possibilities. It may be added that this great development of inland commerce has occurred almost wholly under the Republican policy of protection to home industries and domestic trade.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

So far as public opinion can be gauged by the discussion of the question of the proposed removal of the State University to this city is practically settled against removal. There is a general consensus of opinion that removal would imply a great extension of the foundation and operations of the university and a large increase of taxation, both present and prospective, and that it would be unwise to commit the State to that policy.

But the settlement of this phase of the question has raised another, and that is whether the State should maintain a university at all. Whether the promoters of the removal scheme intended to raise this question or not, they have done so, and future discussion of the subject is likely to be on that line. There is a strong feeling in the State that the State is sufficiently well supplied with higher institutions of learning through the efforts of private and denominational enterprise, and that it is unwise for the State to compete with these. It is asserted, and not without reason, that the maintenance of a State university does not rest on the same grounds of public duty as the support of public schools. Those who hold this view declare that while it is undoubtedly the duty of the State to furnish all its children with the facilities for obtaining a common school education free of charge, it is under no obligation to maintain an institution of higher culture and classical learning. "There are those," it is said, "who regard the support of such an institution by the State as not only class legislation, but a needless expenditure of money, since the interests of higher education are already abundantly subserved by sectarian institutions. Future discussion of the university question will be on this line, and those who favor continuing appropriations must be prepared to show that the duty of the State to maintain such an institution is as plain and obligatory as the duty of supporting free schools.

THE BUTTER BACILLUS.

So many alarming things about bacteria have been told by scientific sharps in recent years that the general public has come to look upon those minute forms of life as invariably objectionable, not to say dangerous. It has been shown, it is true, that there are many species of bacteria, but according to the common view this is a case of dog eating dog, one variety being as much to be avoided as another. It must necessarily wrench the popular mind to bring it to regard anything that goes by the name of bacteria or bacilli as useful or beneficial to humankind, and especially when they go into the human stomach—this, too, in spite of the fact that human flesh and blood and bones are said to swarm with organisms of different tribes and family names. But now comes a scientist, Professor Cornwell, by name, who has been experimenting with butter. He finds that the delicious flowery flavor peculiar to June butter is caused by a species of bacteria propagated during the process of ripening or fermentation of the cream. Naturally this propagation is more rapid and extensive in June than in January, and the Professor's efforts have been directed towards the artificial cultivation of the flavoring organism, which he has named "bacillus No. 41."

He has succeeded in doing this by inoculating sterilized milk with a specimen of bacillus No. 41, and when fermentation had taken place pouring the milk into a churn of cream. The result was butter with the coveted June flavor. The experiments have been carried on in a Connecticut creamery, and it is thought they are practical enough to warrant a general adoption of the method. If this is done it will follow that a chemist's laboratory will be a necessary feature of every butter-making establishment, and farmers' wives who cannot afford to keep a chemist will buy the inoculating substance just as they now buy yeast or baking powder for their bread. If the June butter bacteria can be induced to enter oleomargarine the public will duly profit thereby and be disposed to offer bacillus No. 41 a medal.

THE PLAIN-SPEAKING EX-CHAIRMAN.

Ex-Chairman Jewett told more truth to the lines of mourners along the rather frugal tables of the Jackson celebration, much more truth than if he had undertaken to praise the statesmanship of Grover Cleveland. He gave a clew to some of the causes which induced disgusted men who had been Democrats all their lives to become Republicans in the voting booths. They were disgusted with the fact that they did not get offices, but at the sort of men who were given them, and who by virtue thereof became very officious in the organization. They are disgusted at seeing "the crafty, the insistent, the brazen, the dependents and incapables" made the recipients of public position at the hands of Democratic Senators and Representatives in Congress, and also at the hands of other Democratic officials who have positions to fill. They are disgusted at the vulgar greed which has led Congressmen to make their sons clerks of committees and their daughters chairmen, appointed to the Naval Academy, or to compel the appointment in other branches of the public service. They are also disgusted because Democrats who have been elected to good positions have made so many relatives subordinates instead of filling the places at their disposal with competent men who are deserving. But Mr. Jewett is evidently mistaken in his inference that the men who have become disgusted and voted the other ticket are those who have rendered party service to the expectation of office.

HUBBLES IN THE AIR.

A Self-Contained Man.

"Tell you," said the grizzled-skinned Democratic gentleman, whose voice evidenced a case of tonsillitis Jacksonianis, "tell you, a man who kin stand temptation like Dave Hill kin be the man for my country."

"When did he ever withstand temptation?" asked the mugwump gentleman.

"Why, when he went to dinner with ole Grover. I couldn't no more a helped accidentally fall over that there forty foot

Such men, as a rule, will be found to have sulkily voted the Democratic ticket last November. Besides being disgusted with the selfishness of the dispensers of patronage and the quality of the men called to the public service, those Democrats who voted some other ticket in November were more incensed by the brazen greed of such men as Green Smith and with the very general raid made by officials upon the public treasury, who pay favorites more than the market price, and in the aggregate permit a horde to nibble county and township funds. They are Democrats weary with seeing men paid three days' salary on election boards for one day's service. They are more than disgusted with gerrymander legislatures and their lack of public spirit and their superabundance of stupidity and selfishness which is akin to dishonesty.

Republicans in Indiana who have come into positions of honor and influence will find that for thought in the death-bed confession of Mr. Jewett. As a party it may profit by it.

Theodore Lambert entered a house in New Jersey over a year ago in the night time for the purpose of robbery. The man whom he intended to rob was roused and undertook to defend his home, and Lambert shot him dead. He was tried, convicted and sentenced to be hanged Dec. 13, 1894. Upon the solicitation of the condemned man's friends the Governor granted a reprieve until Jan. 1, 1895.

As soon as the reprieve was granted Lambert's lawyers raised the question of the propriety of setting free the man who had been sentenced to be hanged on the ground that an agreement had been made with which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

of his if I had been Dave than I could refuse a drink before breakfast."

EYE AND EAR.

I know a maiden fair to see—
Alas, alas, oh dear!
Her warbling of "Sweet Marie"
Is horrible to hear.

WAR STARTED.

Mrs. Grogan—Would you believe it now, if it was to tell you that Pinnegan's goat ate a four-dollar bill belonging to me could you?

Mrs. Hogan—Oh, would not Mrs. Grogan. If it was a war-dollar bill I would try to be have it, though it would be hard to do this long after pay-day.

Appropriate.

"Tommy," said Mr. Figg, sternly, "I hung a motto in your room to the effect that if little boys should be seen and not heard."

"Yes."

"I find that it has disappeared."

"Yes."

"What did you do with it?"

"I took it down to the deaf 'n' dumb orphan asylum."

CRUELTY SLAIN.

(Concluded from First Page.)

banking and currency, assured the gentleman that they had agreed to do so, and that they would be ready to do so at any time.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. Blund wanted to know if any opportunity was offered to amend the bill by the enacting clause (when would kill the bill) would be given. Mr. Outwaite said that the amendment was not in the bill and that there would be no disposition to change the bill by amendments, but Mr. Blund was not satisfied, and insisted on a release from the rule or on an agreement to be had by which a vote could be had on the amendment.